

(DRAFT) Accountability in Higher Education in Washington

State Legislative/Administrative History

1986	HECB highlights issue of accountability in master plan
1987	Biennial budget provision calls on HECB and SBCTC to report to the Legislature concerning a number of accountability/assessment measures
1995	<p>Budget directs institutions to report to HECB on strategies to meet increasing demands for efficiency, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty contact• Time-to-degree/certificate• Graduation rates• Increasing number of degrees per instructional faculty
1997	<p>Budget established requirement for performance goals in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Graduation efficiency index (95% 'native'/90% transfer)• Student retention (95% research/90% comprehensive)• Five-year graduation rates (65% research/55% comprehensive)• Faculty productivity• A campus-specific accountability measure <p>Two percent of non-instructional funding (\$10.7 million) withheld from baccalaureate institutions, placed in reserve, to be released upon certification by HECB that institutions met performance targets. \$9.1 million was eventually released; \$1.5 million not released to institutions, and lapsed to the Education Savings Account</p> <p>Two-year colleges have similar framework of performance goals (wages for vocational graduates, academic transfer rate increases, core course completion, graduation efficiency index), partial funding withheld in reserve</p> <p>HEC Board recommends release of all funds for first year of budget.</p>
1998	HEC Board publishes report entitled, "Performance Funding and Accountability," reporting two-thirds of goals (39 of 58 separate measures) were met or exceeded. HEC Board recommends release of 77% of withheld funds, creation of incentive pool of performance funds available through competitive grants; report encourages new assessment projects in quantitative skills and technology literacy.

1999	<p>Budget does not withhold funds. Baccalaureate institutions directed to report to HECB annual progress toward goals (goals from 1997-99 budget).</p> <p>Fall Accountability Forums agreed to emphasize student learning outcomes (writing, information and technology literacy, quantitative reasoning)</p>
2000	<p>HB 2375 directs public baccalaureates to define information and technology literacy, develop strategies for measuring achievement, and report (Jan. '02) on the feasibility of and plans for implementation.</p> <p>HEC Board publishes report entitled, "Performance Accountability," recommends against budgetary penalties linked to performance measures, recommends re-evaluating goals set by Legislature in 97-99 budget.</p>
2001	<p>Budget does not include indicators, targets; directs HEC Board to set targets and requires institutions to prepare accountability plans to achieve measurable and specific improvement. HEC Board delegates to institutions responsibility for setting meaningful targets</p>
2003	<p>HEC Board reviews targets, publishes "Higher Education Accountability Plans" report, recommends changing August deadline for accountability plans since data are not available until October.</p>
2004	<p>HB 3103 revises HEC Board responsibilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEC board "shall establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals" • "Each four-year institution and the state board for community and technical colleges shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvements each academic year on statewide and institution-specific measures." The HEC Board "shall approve biennial performance targets." <p>HEC Board adopts master plan, including initiative for greater accountability.</p>
2005	<p>HEC Board adopts accountability framework April 5th.</p> <p>Biennial budget adopted April 24th, specifying several performance measures on which institutions are to set performance targets.</p>

Accountability System

Policy
Audit

“Accountability is not systematically used to help focus institutional attention on a limited number of state priorities.”

-- National Collaborative for Postsecondary Education Policy

Master
Plan

“By re-designing the state’s higher education accountability system, the state can identify and address the strengths and weaknesses at the institution, sector, and state levels to better promote student success.”

Develop and implement accountability model measuring progress to statewide goals

HECB
Model

Framework outlines indicators for baccalaureate institutions:

- Number of degrees awarded
- Number of bachelor’s degrees in high-demand areas
- Six-year graduation rates
- Three-year graduation rate (transfer students)
- Persistence rates for fourth-year transfer students
- Graduation efficiency index (non-transfer students)
- Graduation efficiency index (transfer students)

Framework indicators for community and technical college system

- Students prepared for work*
- Number of technical associate degrees awarded
- Number of students making gains in basic skills*
- Students prepared for transfer*
- Number of academic associate degrees awarded

2005-07
Budget

Base funding increases approved for institutions. Institutions required to “show demonstrable progress” toward specified six-year goals.

- Proportion of students who graduate within 125% of credits required
- Proportion of degrees awarded to Pell grant recipients
- Freshman retention
- National ranking for federal research grants
- Job placement or graduate school acceptance rates
- Number of accredited programs

* Also included in budget as performance indicators.